UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,898	08/28/2006	Toru Sasabe	2006_0455A	2079

52349 7590 03/17/2011

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK L.L.P.
1030 15th Street, N.W.
Suite 400 East
Washington, DC 20005-1503

EXAMINER	
SU, SARAH	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2431	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/17/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com
eoa@wenderoth.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/573,898	SASABE, TORU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sarah Su	2431	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 November 2010 and 24 November 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *19,20,22-29 and 31-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *19, 20, 22-29, 31-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5 November 2010 has been entered. In this amendment, claims 19 and 28 have been amended.

2. Claims 19, 20, 22-29, and 31-36 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 19, 20, 22-29, and 31-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 19, 20, 22, 28, 29, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens et al. (US 2003/0048174 A1 and Stevens hereinafter) in view of Vick et al. (US Patent 7,082,532 B1 and Vick hereinafter).

As to claims 19 and 28, Stevens discloses a system and method for wirelessly transmitting a password that can be used to unlock/lock a password protected electronic device, the system and method having:

a first electronic apparatus (104, Figure 1)**;**

a second electronic apparatus connected to the first electronic apparatus via an apparatus control line (102, Figure 1)**,**

wherein the second electronic apparatus comprises a second storage device for previously storing a password (0015, lines 1-2)**,**

wherein the first electronic apparatus comprises:

a first storage device for previously storing the password (0016, lines 10-12)**;**

a control device for (i) requesting the second electronic apparatus to transmit the password stored in the second storage device at an activation of the first electronic apparatus, (ii) receiving the password stored in the second storage device from the second electronic apparatus, (iii) comparing the password received from the second electronic apparatus with the password stored in the first storage device, and (iv), when the password received from the second electronic apparatus coincides with the password stored in the first storage device, executing a security

function so as to start an operation of the first electronic apparatus (0016, lines 10-16)**;**

a display device for displaying a message to a user (0022, lines 8-12)**;**

an input device for inputting the password (0022, lines 8-12)**.**

Stevens fails to specifically disclose:

wherein, when the password received from the second electronic apparatus does not coincide with the password stored in the first storage device: first, the control device displays, on the display device, a request for the user to input a password via the input device;

second the user inputs the requested password;

third the control device compares the password inputted by the user via the input device with the password stored in the first storage device, such that, when the password inputted by the user coincides with the password stored in the first storage device, the control device starts the operation of the first electronic apparatus.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Stevens, as taught by Vick.

Vick discloses a system and method for providing distributed web server authentication, the system and method having:

wherein, when the password received from the second electronic apparatus (i.e. credential cookie) **does not coincide with the password stored in the first storage device** (i.e. user doesn't have valid credential cookie)**: first,**

the control device displays, on the display device, a request for the user to input a password via the input device (i.e. logon page) (col. 3, lines 51-55)**;**

second the user inputs the requested password (col. 3, lines 54-55)**;**

third the control device compares the password inputted by the user via the input device with the password stored in the first storage device, such that, when the password inputted by the user coincides with the password stored in the first storage device, the control device starts the operation (i.e. allows access to) **of the first electronic apparatus** (col. 3, lines 56-59; col. 4, lines 5-10)**.**

Given the teaching of Vick, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Stevens with the teachings of Vick by allowing entry of a user inputted password in order to start operation. Vick recites motivation by disclosing that using a cookie to pass credentials and allowing a user to input a password for authentication when the cookie fails provides for a system that is simpler to implement than ID and password or certificate systems while permitting the immediate revocation of user authentication (i.e. when password has changed) (col. 2, lines 59-64). It is obvious that the teachings of Vick would have improved the teachings of Stevens by authenticating a user by an inputted password when an initial attempt has failed in order to provide for an authentication system that allows for a user to be authenticated without repeatedly entering authentication information while also allowing for a user's access to be revoked.

As to claims 20 and 29, Stevens discloses:

> **wherein, when the password received from the second electronic apparatus does not coincide with the password stored in the first storage device, the control device executes the security function so as to stop the operation of the first electronic apparatus** (0016, lines 16-19)**.**

As to claims 22 and 31, Stevens fails to specifically disclose:

> **wherein, when the password inputted by the user does not coincide with the password stored in the first storage device, the control device stops the operation of the first electronic apparatus.**

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Stevens, as taught by Vick.

Vick discloses:

> **wherein, when the password inputted by the user does not coincide with the password stored in the first storage device, the control device stops the operation** (i.e. denies access to) **of the first electronic apparatus** (col. 4, lines 46-50, 65-67)**.**

Given the teaching of Vick, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Stevens with the teachings of Vick by preventing access to an apparatus if the password inputted by the user is incorrect. Please refer to the

motivation recited above with respect to claims 19 and 28 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Vick to the teachings of Stevens.

6. Claims 24-27 and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens in view of Vick as applied to claims 19 and 28 above, and further in view of Chou et al. (US Patent 5,892,906 and Chou hereinafter).

As to claims 24 and 33, Stevens in view of Vick fails to specifically disclose:

> **wherein the first electronic apparatus further comprises a third storage device for previously storing a special password other than the password stored in the first storage device,**
>
> **wherein the control device compares the password inputted by the user with the special password stored in the third storage device,**
>
> **wherein, when the password inputted by the user coincides with the special password stored in the third storage device, the control device starts the operation of the first electronic apparatus.**

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Stevens in view of Vick, as taught by Chou.

Chou discloses a system and method for preventing theft of computer devices, the system and method having:

> **wherein the first electronic apparatus further comprises a third storage device for previously storing a special password other than the password stored in the first storage device** (col. 4, lines 20-24)**,**

wherein the control device compares the password inputted by the user with the special password stored in the third storage device (col. 4, lines 10-19)**,**

wherein, when the password inputted by the user coincides with the special password stored in the third storage device, the control device starts the operation of the first electronic apparatus (col. 4, lines 10-19)**.**

Given the teaching of Chou, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Stevens in view of Vick with the teachings of Chou by using another password to start operation of a device. Chou recites motivation by disclosing that two keys are provided in the event that one key is mislaid (col. 4, lines 20-24). It is obvious that the teachings of Chou would have improved the teachings of Stevens in view of Vick by providing for an alternative password that can start operation of a device in order to provide for access even if a first password is lost.

As to claims 25 and 34, Stevens discloses:

wherein the control device executes the detecting performed by the first detecting device and the detecting performed by the second detecting device during the operation of the first electronic apparatus (0015, lines 9-13)**.**

Stevens in view of Vick fails to specifically disclose:

a first detecting device for detecting whether or not the second electronic apparatus is connected to the first electronic apparatus via the apparatus control line;

a second detecting device for, when the first detecting device detects that the second electronic apparatus is connected to the first electronic apparatus, detecting whether or not the second electronic apparatus has the security function using a control signal of the apparatus control line.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Stevens in view of Vick, as taught by Chou. Chou discloses:

a first detecting device for detecting whether or not the second electronic apparatus is connected to the first electronic apparatus via the apparatus control line (45, Figure 5)**;**

a second detecting device for, when the first detecting device detects that the second electronic apparatus is connected to the first electronic apparatus, detecting whether or not the second electronic apparatus has the security function using a control signal of the apparatus control line (44, 45, Figure 5)**.**

Given the teaching of Chou, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Stevens in view of Vick with the teachings of Chou by detecting if an

apparatus is connected and if a security function exists. Chou recites motivation by disclosing that when a computer is in a locked state (i.e. has security function), the external memory must be connected to the computer in order to discourage theft (col. 2, lines 35-40). It is obvious that the teachings of Chou would have improved the teachings of Stevens in view of Vick by checking if a device has a security function and if a second apparatus is connected in order to ensure that a user is authorized to use a computer and thus discourage theft of the device.

As to claims 26 and 35, Stevens in view of Vick fails to specifically disclose:

> **wherein, when the first detecting device detects that the second electronic apparatus is not connected to the first electronic apparatus, the control device stops processing of the security function, and starts an ordinary operation of the first electronic apparatus.**

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Stevens in view of Vick, as taught by Chou. Chou discloses:

> **wherein, when the first detecting device detects that the second electronic apparatus is not connected to the first electronic apparatus, the control device stops processing of the security function, and starts an ordinary operation of the first electronic apparatus** (col. 5, lines 64-66; col. 6, lines 13-20)**.**

Given the teaching of Chou, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Stevens in view of Vick with the teachings of Chou by starting ordinary operation of a device when a second apparatus is not connected. Chou recites motivation by disclosing that when a user believes theft is a minimal risk, the user may unlock the computer so that the security key is not required (i.e. not connected) (col. 5, lines 63-66). It is obvious that the teachings of Chou would have improved the teachings of Stevens in view of Vick by unlocking the computer if the risk of theft is believed to be low in order to allow for regular operation without attaching a security key.

As to claims 27 and 36, Stevens in view of Vick fails to specifically disclose:

> **wherein, when the second detecting device detects that the second electronic apparatus does not have the security function, the control device stops the processing of the security function, and starts the ordinary operation of the first electronic apparatus.**

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Stevens in view of Vick, as taught by Chou. Chou discloses:

> **wherein, when the second detecting device detects that the second electronic apparatus does not have the security function, the control device stops the processing of the security function, and starts the**

ordinary operation of the first electronic apparatus (i.e. unlocked) (col. 4, lines 61-63)**.**

Given the teaching of Chou, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Stevens in view of Vick with the teachings of Chou by starting an ordinary operation if a security function is not present. Please refer to the motivation recited above with respect to claims 26 and 35 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Chou to the teachings of Stevens in view of Vick.

7. Claims 23 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens in view of Vick as applied to claims 19 and 28 above, and further in view of Karasawa et al. (US Patent 4,786,900 and Karasawa hereinafter).

As to claims 23 and 32, Stevens in view of Vick fails to specifically disclose:

wherein the control device compares the password inputted by the user a predetermined number of times of more than two with the password stored in the first storage device, and, when the password inputted by the user does not coincide with the password stored in the first storage device, the control device stops the operation of the first electronic apparatus.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Stevens in view of Vick, as taught by Karasawa.

Karasawa discloses a system and method for using an electronic key apparatus to unlock a lock, the system and method having:

> **wherein the control device compares the password inputted by the user a predetermined number of times of more than two with the password stored in the first storage device, and, when the password inputted by the user does not coincide with the password stored in the first storage device, the control device stops the operation of the first electronic apparatus** (col. 9, lines 2-10)**.**

Given the teaching of Karasawa, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Stevens in view of Vick with the teachings of Karasawa by allowing a predetermined number of password entry attempts before stopping operation. Karasawa recites motivation by disclosing that by allowing three attempts to correctly enter a password, it is guaranteed that a person who does not know the preset password data cannot use the electronic key (col. 9, lines 8-10). It is obvious that the teachings of Karasawa would have improved the teachings of Stevens in view of Vick by allowing a predetermined number of entry attempts before stopping operation in order to ensure that a person without the proper knowledge cannot gain access, while still accommodating for entry mistakes of an authorized user.

Prior Art Made of Record

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Baron (US 2002/0165971 A1) discloses a system and method for terminating an authentication session upon user sign-off.

b. Bartoli et al. (US Patent 6,047,268) discloses a system and method for billing for transactions over the internet.

c. Cohen et al. (US 2001/0021915 A1) discloses a system and method for compensation driven network based exchange.

d. Kirsch (US Patent 5,963,915) discloses a system and method for performing trans-internet purchase transactions.

e. Otsubo et al. (US 2004/0178881 A1) discloses a system and method for information service terminal.

f. Tom et al. (US 2004/0158574 A1) discloses a system and method for displaying web user's authentication status.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sarah Su whose telephone number is (571) 270-3835. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30AM-5:00PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on (571) 272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sarah Su/
Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/Kaveh Abrishamkar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431